

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 26, 2004. Claims 1 to 4 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 3 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

It is noted that Applicants filed a Request For New Office Action in a paper dated May 17, 2004 and filed in the Patent Office on May 18, 2004. However, as of the present date, and despite numerous telephone calls to the Examiner, the foregoing Request has not been entered into the Patent Office's PAIR system, nor has action been taken on the Request. Therefore, in order to continue prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have chosen to file this Amendment together with the accompanying RCE and will, to the best of their ability, attempt to address the rejections in the April 26, 2004 Office Action.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,175 (Sturgeon), while Claims 1 to 4 appear to have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,084,638 (Hare) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,503 (Perkes). In this regard, as for the § 103(a) rejection, the Office Action merely states that the rejection is under § 103(a) over Hare, but later appears to incorporate the Perkes patent, although that reference has not been made formally of record in the application. Accordingly, Applicants will address the rejection as being based on Hare in view of Perkes, but it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the status of Perkes as a reference and consequently, the basis of the rejections. Nonetheless, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns controlling a display on a display apparatus, such as a TV monitor. According to the invention, the display apparatus (e.g., TV monitor 120) controls a display unit and a connecting unit thereof (e.g., display device 127 and

display interface 126) to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus (e.g., computer (PC) 101) if a first mode (e.g., PC mode 401) is selected by a remote controller (e.g., remote controller 144), and the display unit and the connecting unit are controlled so as to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus (i.e., as a television) if a second mode (e.g., TV mode 406) is selected by the remote controller. (See, for example, page 14, lines 7 to 24.) As a result, the TV can operate to display a TV signal in one mode, and can operate as a monitor of a computer in another mode, where a user can operate input/output devices connected to the TV.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a display apparatus, comprising a remote controller, a display unit, a connecting unit which forms a connection between the display apparatus and an external apparatus, and a control unit which controls the display unit and the connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by the remote controller, and controls the display unit and the connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Newly-added independent Claim 3 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 3, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display unit and a connecting unit of a display apparatus to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit and the

connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Sturgeon is merely seen to disclose that an apparatus 100 includes a display unit 110 and a computer system 115 which is controllable by a remote controller 125 such as a remote track-ball/mouse device, keyboard, etc. (see column 3, lines 50 to 55).

However, unlike the present invention, the display unit 110 of Sturgeon is not seen to include a connection unit and a control unit that are controllable by the remote controller so that they can be switched between a display mode for a TV and a display mode for a PC.

Therefore, Sturgeon is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display unit and a connecting unit of a display apparatus to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit and the connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not believed to be anticipated by Sturgeon.

Hare is merely seen to disclose an interface extension system in which the display of a PC can be displayed on a television, thereby permitting users to operate interactive PC games on the screen of a television. However, Hare is not seen to disclose or to suggest that a display of the television is changed based on a mode selected by a remote controller. Thus, Hare is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display unit and a connecting unit of a display apparatus to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit and the

connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.


Perkes is not seen to add anything that, when combined with Hare, would have rendered the present invention obvious. In this regard, Perkes is merely seen to disclose the use of a remote controller. However, Perkes is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything with regard to controlling a display unit and a connecting unit of a display apparatus to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit and the connecting unit to operate the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Accordingly, Claims 1 to 4 are not believed to have been obvious over Hare and Perkes.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Edward A. Kmett

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200